## Notes on our Hepatica. IV.

## The genus Fossombronia.

## LUCIEN M. UNDERWOOD.

Among the genera of the Jungermaniales the present genus is perhaps the only one in which the spore markings have been used as specific characters. The older hepaticologists failing to recognize these important characters failed in many instances to discriminate the species and in many of the earlier exsiccatæ the same name covers two or three species which are now clearly recognized by spore characters. Our own species have been indiscriminately referred to common European species and as this was done before the right recognition of species obtained there, we have a complicated tangle of misapplied names to unravel.
In order of sequence the following species have been referred to our flora by various authors.
1821. Schweinitz described ${ }^{1}$ Anthoceros jungermannioides which is evidently a species of Fossombronia as first pointed out by Sullivant in 1845 . While it probably represented $F$. foveolata, our most common species, there is no means at hand of verifying the supposition.
1845. Sullivant distributed ${ }^{2}$ Fossombronia pusilla, from Mobile, Ala. As his specimens, at least in my set of the Musci Alleghanienses, are sterile, it is not possible to determine with certainty what species this is, the foliar characters not being sufficiently distinct to discriminate species properly.
1856. Sullivant again reported ${ }^{3} F$. pusilla from "moist places on the ground; mostly southern." His figure (the same not even approximately represent the spores of any of our he has figured is really $F$. foveolata.
1869. Austin published ${ }^{4} F$. cristula from New Jersey and

[^0]Androcryphia longiseta from California and Texas, giving $F$. longiseta Aust. MS. as a synonym for the latter.
1872. Austin issued four species ${ }^{5}$ as follows: $F$. longiseta no. 118, $F$. angulosa, no. 119, $F$. pusilla, no. 120, and $F$. cristula, no. 121.
1875. Lindberg in commenting on Austin's exsiccatæ ${ }^{6}$ recognizes nos. II8 and 121 as good species, the former allied to $F$. cristata and the latter to $F$. foveolata of Europe. With no. 118, he says, a second species occurs (the Texas specimens) which he briefly characterizes under a name ( $F$. Texana Lindb. MS.). No. II9 he asserts is not $F$. angulosa as known in Europe, and he briefly characterizes the sterile specimens under the MS. name of $F$. salina Lindb. No. 120 he refers doubtfully to $F$. foveolata but later ${ }^{7}$ refers it to this species with more positiveness.
1876. Austin described ${ }^{8} F$. Macouni from Canada (Portage La Lochs, lat. $57^{\circ}$ ), and $F$. Wrightii from Cuba (the latter based on material distributed later in Hep. Cubenses Wrightianæ as " $F$. pusilla"), and briefly characterized the Texan specimens (originally included in $F$. longiseta and named $F$. Texana by Lindberg) under the name of $F$. Cubana (Gott.) Aust., including with them material collected in Cuba by Charles Wright which had been named by Gottsche and were afterwards distributed in Hep. Cubenses Wrightianæ as "F. pusilla, var. Cubana G."

The above species represent all the material that was known to me when the compilation was made for my descriptive catalogue of species. ${ }^{9}$ It is fair to state that at the time of publication of that paper Lindberg's publication noted above was not known to me.
1889. Underwood and Cook issued ${ }^{10}$ specimens of $F$. $D u$ mortieri ${ }^{11}$ as no. 47. This species had previously been cited

[^1]as American by Lindberg (Drummond, Musc. Amer. II. no. 163 from Louisiana).
1892. Underwood reported ${ }^{12}$ F. cristata from Indiana.

From a study of the herbarium material at hand we appear to have the following species:
I. F. angulosa (Dicks.) Raddi. Mem. della Soc. Ital. di Mod. 18: 40 . 1818.
Cuba, Wright; Florida, Underwood; Alabama, Underwood; Texas, Thurow. The specimens issued in Hep. Amer. no. 118 differ from representative European specimens in shorter elaters and slightly larger spores, in both particulars varying in the direction of $F$. foveolata. They are apparently dioicous.
2. F. cristata Lindb. "apud Soc. pro F. et Fl. fenn. die 6th Dec. 1873" Not. pro F. et Fl. fenn. 13: 388. $1874 .^{13}$
Indiana, Underwood; Ohio, Werner.
3. F. cristula Aust. Proc. Phila. Acad. 1869: 228. 1869.

New Jersey, Austin; Distributed in Hep. Bor.-Am. no. 121 .
4. F. foveolata Lindb. "apud Soc. pro F. et Fl. fenn. die 6 Dec. 1873." Not. pro F. et Fl. fenn. 13: 382. $1874 .^{13}$
Maine, Rand; New Jersey, Austin; Delaware, Commons, Fames; Ontario, Macoun, Britton; British Columbia, Macoun. Sterile specimens from South Carolina, Ravenel, seem also to belong here as is also the case with various similar specimens in exsiccatæ. ${ }^{14}$ Distributed in Hep. Amer. as F. Dumortieri, no. 47.
5. F. longiseta Aust. as syn. Proc. Phila. Acad. 1869: 228. 1869.

Androcryphia longiseta Aust. 1. c.
California, Bolander, Brandegee, Farlow, Parish, Howve. no. 157 .
6. F. Texana Lindb. Acta Soc. Scien. fenn. 10: 533. 1875.

[^2]F. Cubana (Goth.) Aust. Bot. Bulletin (now Bot. Gazette) 1: 36. 1876.
F. pusilla, var. Cubana Gat., name only, in Hep. Cubenses Wrightianæ.
Cuba, Wright; Austin also reported it from Texas but I have no means of verifying the reference.
7. F. Wrightil Aust. Bot. Bulletin (now Bot. Gazette) 1: 36.1876.
Cuba, Wright.

## SPECIES DUBIた.

8. F. pusilla (L.) Dumort. Recueil dobs. sur les Jung. II. $1835{ }^{15}$

This species so often alluded to in the above references must be placed in the doubtful list as we are unable to cite a single fertile plant from any part of North America.
9. F. Salina Lindb. Acta Soc. Scien. fenn. 10: 533. 1875. F. angulosa Aust. Hep. Bor.-Am. no. 119, not Raddi.

This species founded on sterile specimens will have to be placed in the doubtful list unless fertile specimens can be found. It is unfortunate that it was ever given a name!
io. F. Macouni Aust. Bot. Bulletin (now Bot. Gazette) 1:36. 1876.
"Portage La Lochs, lat. $57^{\circ}$, Macoun." I have seen no specimens of this species. Mr. Pearson writes me that no specimens exist in either of the parts of the Austin collection; nor does Mr. Macoun, its collector, possess any specimens.

In order to facilitate the determination of our species I append the following table with the more important characters emphasized.
*Spores clearly foveolate or reticulate.
Elaters few or wanting; spores pale brown, 35-44 $\mu$; paroicous
F. cristula.

Elaters abundant; spores dark brown.
Dioicous; spores $35-40$ with few reticulations; elaters $220-250 \mu$. . . . . . . F. angulosa. Heteroicous; spores $42-50 \mu$ with more numerous reticulations; elaters $120-135 \mu$. . F. foveolata.

[^3]**Spores spinulose-cristate, the crests only occasionally anastomosing.
Dioicous.
Spores $29-40 \mu$; elaters $160-300 \mu$. . F. longiseta. Spores $50-60 \mu$; elaters $135-200 \mu$. . F. Texana.
Heteroicous; spores 29-40 ; elaters about $120 \mu$.

Having never seen F. Macouni I can only quote Austin's description of its spores: "Sporis parviusculis subopacis densissime minutissime papillosis." It would doubtless fall in the table near $F$. Wrightii.
It is hoped that collectors will send in material illustrating more fully the distribution of this interesting genus. The species all grow in sandy or clayey soil, closely creeping, and for the most part produce their spores late in the season. I desire also that those who possess either Austin's Hep. Bor. Am. or Sullivant's Musc. Alleg. examine the species above noted for spores and report any modifications necessary in the statements. The spores of the European species have been figured in accessible works, e. g. Not. pro Fl. et Faun. Fenn 13: pl. r. and Rev. Bryol. 17: pl. г. These include Ff. angulosa, foveolata, cristata, and pusilla besides other species not found in America.
Auburn, Ala.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Spec. Fl. Am. Sept. 25. 1821.
    ${ }^{2}$ Musc. Alleg. no. 277. 1845 .
    ${ }^{3}$ Mosses and Ho. 277. 1845.
    (ed. 2.) and Hepaticæ of the Eastern U. S. in Gray, Man. 691. 1856. ${ }^{\text {'Proc. Phila. Acad. 1869; 228. } 1869 .}$

[^1]:    ${ }^{5}$ Hepaticæ Boreali-Americanæ.
    ${ }^{6}$ Hepaticæ in Hiberniæ lectæ. Acta Soc. Scien. Fenn. 10:533. 1875.
    ${ }^{7}$ Rev. Bryol. 12: 39. 1885.
    ${ }^{8}$ Bot. Bulletin (now Bot. Gazette) 1: 36. 1876.
    ${ }^{9}$ Bull. Ill. State Lab. Nat. Hist. 2: 1-133. 1884.
    ${ }^{10}$ Hepaticæ Americanæ; dec. V-VI. N 1889.
    ${ }^{11}$ The name of this species here given cannot stand under the present rules of nomenclature as it was based on a nomen nudum and that issued in exsiccatz. Lindberg's original name, therefore, must hold. The synonymy of the species is as follows:

    Fossombronia foveolata Lindb. 1873.
    Codonia
    Codonia Dumortieri Hueb. et Genth. Deutschlands Lebermoose in Fossombronia Dumortieri Exem no. 8o, 1837; name only.
    Fossombronia Dumortieri Lindb. Not. pro F. et Fl Fe

[^2]:    ${ }^{12}$ Proc. Ind. Acad. Science 1891: 90. 1892.
    I have been unable to verify the earlier citations of Lindberg. The species
    ${ }^{14}$ E. g., Musce in the second paper cited, with illustrations of the spores.
    no. 64. g., Musc. Alleg. no. 277. Hep. Bor.-Am. no. 120. Canadian Hepat.

[^3]:    ${ }^{15}$ Dumortier clearly intended to write "pusilla" at this reference, but by a singular typographical error he wrote "pumila" which happens to be also one of the species of the Linnaean genus Jungermania.

